



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/151,555	09/11/1998	RAJEEB HAZRA	42390.P5277	7941

7590

01/28/2003

HOWARD A SKAIST  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD 7TH FL  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ROGERS, SCOTT A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/151,555

Applicant(s)

HAZRA ET AL.

Examiner

Scott A Rogers

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 08 November 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

To briefly review, Applicant argues that Go performs several additional and differing processing steps not required in claim 1. Applicant argues that in their application, the video frame is coded without performing these additional process steps and that the frame is the object that is coded rather than the reduced image R as in Go. Applicant points out that Go discloses a method of edge detection and frame encoding wherein the method used for decoding is dependent upon the detection and use of edge information in the encoding. That is, applicant argues, the coded image transferred in Go is of reduced image R which provides inadequate information to fully decode the image without use of extensive edge information which is coded and transferred separately.

Applicant argues that their application conversely discloses one method of video frame enhancement where video quality improvements may be made on a decoded image by making available to the post-processor reliable signal information about edges in the video frame. The edge information is not required a required component to decoding an image, but is used as optional enhancement information that may be used to varying degrees.

However, the claims do not positively recite the limitations argued. Go discloses the "capability" to generate an edge detection map, the "capability" to compress the edge detection map, and the "capability" to compress the edge detection map separately from the frame that is to be coded. Applicant would need to change the scope of the claim by limiting the coder to positively include both functions or modes of operation, where one mode includes compressing an edge detection map and the other mode does not include compressing an edge detection map.

Claim 6 does not include using any number of coding techniques as argued. Also, despite what is in applicant's specification, the claims do not positively recite any of the multiple methods of edge detection which are not employed by Go.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16, 19-23, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Go (US 5878172) as set forth in the prior Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 5, 15, 17, 24, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Go as applied to claims 4, 14, 16, 23, and 26 above, and further in view of Fan (US 5359676) as set forth in the prior Office Action.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Go as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Schreiber (US 3035121) as set forth in the prior Office Action.

Claims 9, 10, 18, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Go as applied to claims 4, 14, 16, 23, and 26 above, and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03) as set forth in the prior Office Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott A Rogers by telephone at 703-305-4726 and by e-mail address at [scott.rogers@uspto.gov](mailto:scott.rogers@uspto.gov).

The official fax number for Technology Center 2600 where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC 2600 Customer Service at 703-306-0377.

  
SCOTT ROGERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

27 January 2003